

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



In re Application of  
Se Joon DOKKO

Serial No.: 10/626,580

Filed: July 25, 2003

For: CALL PICK-UP SYSTEM AND METHOD IN A MOBILE COMMUNICATION  
NETWORK

Confirmation No.: 9531

Group Art Unit: 2683

Examiner: Ariel Balaosing

Customer No.: 34610

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Customer Service Window - Mail Stop AF  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Sir:

Applicants request review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this Request. This Request is being filed with a Notice of Appeal. The review is requested for the reasons stated below in the Remarks.

**REMARKS**

This review is being requested because Applicant believes that the rejections of record from the Examiner are clearly not proper and are without basis. For example, the Examiner commits a clear error in asserting that Ardon discloses receiving a request for a second mobile terminal to pick up the call directed to the first mobile terminal in response to the ringing when Ardon clearly discloses receiving the request during call set up and before ringing (see, Applicant's arguments in the Amendment filed July 12, 2006, pages 6-7).

Further, in the Advisory Action dated July 24, 2006, the Examiner references Ardon, col. 5, lines 46-57 as disclosing that "wireless devices 155 and 170 display the TCLID and provide some form alert, for example, a "ping ring" or other signal which indicates a call pickup call" (see, Advisory Action, Response to Arguments). However, these portions merely relate to displaying and alerting other wireless devices in a group allowed to pick up the call. This is not picking up the call directed to the first mobile terminal in response to the ringing of the first mobile terminal, as recited in the claims of the present application. Ardon does not disclose or suggest ringing the destination wireless device, device 115, or another device, devices 155 or 170, picking up the call directed to device 115 in response to the ringing of device 115. The Examiner has committed clear error in making these assertions.

Moreover, the Examiner commits a clear error in asserting that Ardon discloses transmitting information to the first mobile terminal (destination of the call) indicating a number of the second mobile terminal that received the transferred call when Ardon only discloses displaying the destination number being called at other wireless devices in a group allowed to pick up the call, thus allowing another phone to request pick up of the call (see, Applicant's arguments in the Amendment filed July 12, 2006, page 7).

In addition, in contrast to the Examiner's assertions in the Advisory Action, displaying the TLCID of the called destination to all mobile devices allowed to pick up the call, is not transmitting information to the destination mobile terminal indicating a number of the mobile terminal that received the transferred call, as recited in the claims of the present application. This is clear error on the part of the Examiner.

**CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and that claims 27-29, 31-34 and 36 be allowed.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim  
Registration No. 36,186  
Frederick D. Bailey  
Registration No. 42,282

P. O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, VA 20153-1200  
703 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlg  
Date: October 5, 2006  
\\Fk4\\Documents\\2029\\2029-036\\105335.doc